



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,376	06/01/2007	Bhanu Prakash K.N.	6565-76234-01/RJP	2955
24197 7590 12/24/2009 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER FONTENOT, NIGEL RAI				
ART UNIT 3768		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 12/24/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/586,376

Applicant(s)

K.N. ET AL.

Examiner

NIGEL FONTENOT

Art Unit

3768

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the Arguments filed September 4, 2009. Claims 1-34 are pending. Examiner contacted Applicant for possible examiner amendment to the claims, however Applicant has not replied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 1 is confusing as it is unclear what applicant is trying to claim. Claim 1 recites: "A method comprising: (a) determining a candidate sagittal direction for a brain image, said brain image define by...said determining said candidate sagittal direction comprising: defining a first three-dimensional...determining, from said first, second and third measure plots...associated therewith." The method is not directed to performing a process, and therefore the steps of the claim do not recite any positively recited steps. The preamble of the claim is unclear as it does not specify a method of performing or doing something. The claim should recite something similar to: "A method of determining a candidate sagittal direction for a brain image, said brain image defined by brain volume data...said candidate sagittal direction being...to an actual sagittal direction, comprising: defining a first three-dimensional volume..." Also claim 1 should

recite a measured quantity or measured value and not determining a measure for each slice. Similar indefinite language is found in the other claims. Proper action is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ardekani et al. ("Automatic Detection of the Mid-Sagittal Plane in 3D Brain Images").
6. Addressing claims 11-13, Ardekani discloses a method for obtaining an approximate location for a mid-sagittal slice from a plurality of slices of brain volume data, where the plurality of slices is generally oriented parallel to the mid-sagittal plane and positioned along an axis normal to the mid-sagittal plane including outputting coordinates of the brain volume data contain in said candidate mid-sagittal slice as vertices and determining an optimized mid-sagittal plane by using the mid-sagittal plane in an optimization technique to produce the optimized plane (see Method's section and figs. 1-3).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-10 and 25-34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
8. Claims 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
10. The closest prior art, Ardekani et al. ("Automatic Detection of the Mid-Sagittal Plane in 3D Brain Images"), Liu et al. ("Automatic Extraction of the Central Symmetry (Mid-Sagittal) Plane from Neuroradiology Images"), Prima et al. ("Computation of the Mid-Sagittal Plane in 3D Images of the Brain"), Liu et al. ("Robust Midsagittal Plane Extraction from Normal and Pathological 3-D Neuroradiology Images"), and Hu et al. (WO 03/060827) do not disclose determining a candidate sagittal direction for a brain image defined in three-dimensional space along three directions orthogonal to each other. The prior art also does not disclose determining a candidate sagittal direction where the brain image is defined by brain volume data in two direction orientated at an angle to each other.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NIGEL FONTENOT whose telephone number is (571)270-7032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00a-4:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 3768

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3768